Interview Summary

Application No.
09/749,645 Applicant(s)
Gohr et al.

P ter Szekely 1714 All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Peter Szekely (3) (2) David Rodrigues Date of Interview Jun 5, 2003 Type: a) X Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c) Personal (copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative) Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: All Identification of prior art discussed: Rosenquist et al. 6,353,046 Agreement with respect to the claims fil was reached. qiX was not reached. hi N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Rodrigues argued that the ('046) patent proved that the addition of the cyclic polysiloxane did not depress the melt viscosity of the polycarbonate. The examiner promised to give th argument serious consideration when submitted in writing. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached